

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEJANDRO PAZ,

Petitioner,

v.

STU SHERMAN, Warden,

Respondent.

No. 1:20-cv-00177-NONE-JLT (HC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS, DIRECTING THE CLERK OF
COURT TO CLOSE THIS CASE AND
DECLINING TO ISSUE CERTIFICATE OF
APPEALABILITY

(Doc. Nos. 7 & 11)

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding in propria persona with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On June 29, 2020, the magistrate judge assigned to the case issued findings and recommendations recommending that respondent's motion to dismiss the pending petition be granted. (Doc. No. 11.) The findings and recommendations were served upon all parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within thirty days from the date of service of that order. To date, no party has filed objections.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

////

1 In addition, the court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. A state prisoner
2 seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of
3 his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. 28 U.S.C. § 2253; *Miller-El*
4 v. *Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 335-336 (2003).

If a court denies a petitioner’s petition, the court may only issue a certificate of appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must establish that “reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were ‘adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.’” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)).

12 In the present case, the court finds that petitioner has not made the required substantial
13 showing of the denial of a constitutional right to justify the issuance of a certificate of
14 appealability. Reasonable jurists would not find the court's determination that petitioner is not
15 entitled to federal habeas corpus relief debatable, wrong, or deserving of encouragement to
16 proceed further. Thus, the court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

17 || Accordingly:

18 1. The findings and recommendations, filed June 29, 2020 (Doc. No. 11), are
19 adopted;

20 2. Respondent's motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 7) is granted and the petition for writ of
21 habeas corpus is dismissed;

22 3.. The Clerk of Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case for the
23 purposes of closure and then close this case; and

24 4. The court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **August 22, 2020**

Dale A. Troyd
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28